

DYNAMIC ASSATEAGUE

In the 1962 word of the Maryland Board of Natural Resources, Assateague Island is "dynamic," which is to say that it is in motion and changing all the time as a result of the shifting effects of wind, waves, and currents. This summer the State, as represented by the department of forests and parks, is going to do something to help stabilize its own 2-mile fraction of the island. Hydraulic dredges will pump material out of the marshy bay side of the island and use it to build up a 12-foot dune line along the ocean side.

The protective dune line is preparatory to the first phase of the State's park development on Assateague, for which park officials are seeking \$1 million in their next capital budget. The first phase calls for roads and parking lots, a water supply and sewage disposal, underground electric and telephone lines, the leveling and stabilization (mostly with beach grass) of a camping area, toilets and a bathhouse and a superintendent's residence. With this much accomplished, the State will have a usable oceanfront park to go with the bridge which is scheduled to receive traffic at the close of the current summer season.

The State is thus working to uphold its end of the plans for State-Federal development of Assateague for public recreation. But its efforts to stabilize just 2 of the 24 miles of Assateague which lie in Maryland are not too promising, when portions of the island on either side of the State park remain "dynamic." What Maryland needs is Federal action: specifically, congressional action to acquire the rest of the island as a national seashore and thereby to assure that protective measures will be taken to stabilize the extensive stretches now in private hands. As the State begins its own work, it has every reason to step up its pressure on Congress to fulfill its part of what at the executive level is a Federal-State agreement.

U.S. AMBASSADOR TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a short time ago, we in the Senate learned that the U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, Ambassador Lodge, had resigned, and that the President of the United States had appointed, as Ambassador Lodge's successor, General Taylor, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. President, in the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon, this has been a calamitous mistake on the part of the President of the United States. Furthermore, I believe this mistake shows very clearly the undue influence the Pentagon has come to exercise on the White House in the Johnson administration, in connection with U.S. foreign policy.

I believe it most unfortunate that a military officer, a general, who is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and who has been recommending for many months past, an unsound foreign policy in South Vietnam—a policy which, as I said this morning to General Taylor and to Secretary of Defense McNamara, in their briefing before the Foreign Relations Committee, is leading us straight to a major war in Asia—has been appointed U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam. It is a travesty that a military symbol is being appointed U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, an area of the world which, at the very least, is threatening the peace of the world.

Is there no civilian Democrat in a position of leadership whom the President of the United States can appoint civilian Ambassador of the United States to South Vietnam? Of course General Taylor will resign his military commission; but, so far as the rest of the world is concerned, the United States has appointed a general its Ambassador in the most troubled spot in the world today, threatening the peace of the world.

It is an inexcusable mistake, in my judgment, on the part of the President and I shall vote against the nomination when it comes to the Foreign Relations Committee and to the floor of the Senate.

NEVADA GOVERNOR ACCORDED HIGH HONOR

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, contrary to popular impression, the 56th National Governors' Conference in Cleveland was not entirely a warmup for the Republican National Convention. Other events occurred during the session running from June 6 to June 10, including the election of Nevada's Gov. Grant Sawyer as chairman of the 1965 National Governors' Conference.

This is a signal honor for my State, Mr. President. Although Nevada is the fastest growing State in the Nation, it is still one of the smallest in population. Governor Sawyer's election, I believe, was a long overdue recognition of the relatively young Nevada chief executive's industry and ability and a salute to my State's growing importance. I can recall in the 1940's, when as Nevada attorney general, I was elected president of the National Association of Attorneys General, such national honors were rare indeed.

It is interesting to note, I think, that Governor Sawyer once worked in the Capitol here as an elevator operator—as did I—while studying law. Later, after service in the Armed Forces, the young lawyer was quick to launch a career in public service. In addition to being an active Democrat, he was a forceful and energetic district attorney in the Nevada ranching county of Elko. He was only 39 when, in 1958, he rose from district attorney to Governor in one dramatic leap. Governor Sawyer was elected to a second term in 1962 by an overwhelming majority.

An example of Governor Sawyer's initiative was in coauthorship with the Governors of Kentucky and Massachusetts of a civil rights statement introduced at the 1964 National Governors' Conference. This statement, supporting passage of the civil rights bill in Congress, was signed by 40 Governors participating in the National Conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news story on Governor Sawyer's election as National Governor's Conference chairman carried in the Reno Evening Gazette of June 10, 1964.

There being no objection, the article as follows:

[From the Reno Evening Gazette, June 10, 1964]

NEVADAN ELECTED: SAWYER NEW GOVERNORS' CHAIRMAN

CLEVELAND.—Gov. Grant Sawyer today was elected chairman of the 1965 National Governors' Conference, becoming the first Nevadan in history to win the position.

He was nominated without opposition following endorsements in the caucus of each party.

Other contenders for the post, which by procedure must be a Democrat next year, were Govs. John Dempsey of Connecticut, John Connally of Texas, Edmund Brown of California, Richard Hughes of New Jersey and George Wallace of Alabama.

Sawyer and Dempsey were the first and second choices, respectively, of the Democratic caucus late Tuesday and the names of both were submitted to the GOP caucus this morning.

Sawyer won there 12 to 3. With majority backing by both parties his nomination by a five-man committee was a formality.

The Nevada Governor did not campaign for the post. When approached by Democratic leaders early in the week, including a high representative of the National Democratic Committee, the Governor said he would accept the wish of the conference but "would not lift a finger" to win the nomination. Explaining his reluctance, he said the duties of the position would place a severe burden on his small office staff in Nevada.

Governor Sawyer also won backing for creation of a committee to help solve problems of election communication, creation of a committee for better Federal-State cooperation, a call for more stringent beef import quotas and more progressive public land laws and policies.

All Governors supported the suggestion for a committee on election laws and communications to work with newsmen "to explore ways and means of furthering the public interest in the handling and reporting of election results."

Sawyer said the committee should consider the responsibilities of the States on election laws and procedures as well as the overall responsibility of the news media in the handling of returns so that the public interest will best be served.

In his motion, Sawyer cited mutual concern of Governors and of newsmen on the matter of election victory statements before all polls have closed, handicaps imposed upon newsmen in the gathering of returns and antiquated election laws. "We have 'machined' ourselves into what could be a very serious problem—damaging to the prerogatives of a free electorate," he said.

"Flat pronouncements of victory based on early and fragmentary returns and before millions of Americans have cast their votes, have a definite effect on the electorate who have not voted and actually might influence an election."

He noted the danger would be especially acute in a presidential election, because of the time differential between east and west.

In his report as chairman of the committee on State planning, Sawyer said he felt the subject had been adequately covered and asked that the committee be dissolved and be replaced by an advisory committee on executive communication and coordination.

Its job will be to establish a mutually agreeable relationship and communications with the White House and executive agencies on development of federally aided projects in the individual States, Sawyer said.

Statements of policy on the cattle industry and development of natural resources, drafted by Sawyer and Gov. Clifford Hansen of Wyoming, were signed by two-thirds of the State leaders.

More protection for the beef industry won support from 39 Governors while 35 chief executives joined in the call for full development of natural resources, including release of Federal lands for public and private development.

Charging that current levels of foreign livestock shipments to the United States are resulting in losses of millions of dollars to domestic producers, the beef statement urged a more realistic import quota base.

A congressional review of proposals for substantial changes in public land use, toward fewer restrictions to public land development, was the goal set by the Governors in the area of natural resources.

RELIEF OF SENECA INDIANS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement prepared by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] with relation to House bill 1794, for the relief of the Seneca Indians who will be displaced by the flooding of the Kinzua Dam on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania and New York, which bill is still in conference.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

I call to the Senate's attention the fact that we have as yet received no report from the conference committee on H.R. 1794, a bill for the relief of the Seneca Indians, who will be displaced by the flooding of the Kinzua Dam on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania and New York. The committee has been hopelessly deadlocked over the House and Senate versions of the bill. Senate conferees have insisted upon the Senate version, which cut 64 percent of the funds for relief from the House-passed measure.

I note that the conference committee will meet tomorrow afternoon for the first time since May 12. I take this opportunity to deplore the impasse, and urge that the Senate conferees accept the House version, which provides \$20.15 million, a just sum for relocation of the Senecas, compensation for direct and indirect damages the Indian nation will incur, as well as vital rehabilitation of the Senecas.

Our obligation to the Seneca nation is embodied in one of our oldest and most important treaties, based upon a personal promise to the Senecas by George Washington in 1794.

Unless prompt action is taken, the Senecas of the Allegheny Reservation will find themselves underway in the spring of 1965. The Senecas must have sufficient time to reestablish themselves elsewhere before the project is completed.

If the conference committee does not resolve the problem this week, I urge the Senate to consider taking action similar to that called for in H.R. 11801, introduced in the House last week by Representative ABLE of Ohio. Representative ABLE's bill would have the effect of prohibiting the flooding of the Kinzua Dam until a suitable provision for relocation of the Indians has been instituted.

WINNING ESSAYS IN 1964 MCGEE SENATE INTERNSHIP CONTEST

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, in order that the Members of this body may share with me the excellence of thought and the depth of understanding shown by the Wyoming young people who were

honorable mention winners in the 1964 McGee Senate Internship Contest, I ask unanimous consent that two of these essays—by James Helzer, of Cheyenne, and Sandra Rae Clark, of Sheridan—be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By James Albert Helzer)

To understand ways to make democracy work better, we must first of all comprehend the concept of American democracy. We traditionally associate the word "democracy" with popular sovereignty, a doctrine which holds that the citizens of the country are the basis of all political authority. Democracy in our republican America has two distinct aspects. On the one hand, it emphasizes the natural rights of the individual, the limited government, the rule of law, and civil liberties. On the other hand, it portrays a people striving to make social equality a premise of government. When combined, these two aspects become American government. From this we can readily see that American democracy is nothing less than the belief in individual freedom founded upon laws supported by a government of the whole people, by the whole people, in which the majority prevails.

Thus we perceive that the individual is as important to the overall welfare of his country as is the country's welfare to himself. The overall effectiveness in a democracy therefore hinges upon the way in which the respective citizens exercise their powers either in person or through representatives. There has been a failure, nonetheless, by a majority to meet the challenge of individual participation, the prime requirement which citizens of a democratic republic must recognize. An examination in somewhat closer detail dealing with the relation of citizen to state is therefore in order.

Every American citizen has a voice in the policy, which at least occasionally calls upon him to take part in the government by discharging specific services which benefit the people. Yet when the call is sent forth, the majority of the citizenry, which undoubtedly numbers many potential leaders in its ranks, does not respond. The two basic problems of democracies such as ours are spelled out by this single problem. There is the persistent question of good leadership at all levels of government and of the need for securing the political services offered by the best qualified men while still not infringing upon the rights of all men. These services are not all glamor, as that of a Governor or Senator might be, but rather fall in the category of the offices of county chairman, of precinct chairman, to name just two. The latter offices, while lacking in the eminence of the former ones, are just as necessary to the machinery of government, for they as the smaller cogs allow the big cogs to work.

The form of government, a democratic-republic, and the size of the nation magnify manifold these problems of leadership. From the definition originally given democracy, it is not difficult to see that the more who participate the better the governmental operation. It is for this key reason that no justification for a lack of participation can be found, especially if there is a desire to continue the present form of government and to improve it. It is natural at this point to take an additional step and stress that in the United States no one man has any more intrinsic right to hold office than another. Granted now, people must realize that numerous obligations go hand in hand with this right and that these obligations. Some persons more readily qualify to fill certain responsible positions than do others,

but reasonably intelligent men may and should through study qualify themselves for governmental participation.

Concurrently with the leadership problem, there is the issue of the character of rule which may be exercised. Organization of will, essential to effective democratic action, is extremely vulnerable to the pressures of minority groups such as lobbies. The gravity of the situation is even further amplified when the rule is tyrannically exercised by a majority over a minority. It is all important to have all citizens involved.

By placing the two essential problems side by side, we are now able to visualize the twofold responsibility each of us faces: Regardless of race, creed, color, or sex, we must be willing to attempt to lead; but more than this, we must be willing to participate in the cooperative effort influenced only by the qualities of true statesmanship.

Since able participation can never be founded either upon such things as ignorance and bigotry or incited through mob hysteria and selfish interest, participation must have its keystone in a liberal education which fits each citizen for a life of political freedom and selfless concern. In short, the members of the body politic owe it to society to be educated not only while young and in school but also while adults. The overall requirement is clearly one of a broad education dealing with impartial analysis of different views regarding various topics. The direct derivative of such education is the needed sharing in government at every level. The Nation, furthermore, will benefit as there will not be a lack of men able to weigh fairly various interests and views, many not their own, for they will be guided by a background in cases of conflicting claims, platforms, ideas, and the like. Clearly, the Government which calls all to citizenship also calls for the full power of education behind it.

The stimulus thus applied to the adult builds him into an intelligent coworker in the constructive effort of our democratic institutions. The basic problems of the Government are thereby resolved. The leadership question is relieved as more knowledgeable people attempt to lead and are more able to participate with rational "coolheadedness" in functional aspects of government, including the selection of those capable of being representatives of the people at the various governmental levels. We can see that such education and a method of selection for leaders is a necessity, as we realize that the purpose of representatives is to enlarge and refine the public opinion by discerning the true best interests of the populace.

The second problem is resolved simultaneously with the first as the greater participation of all citizens makes it impossible to have either a dominant minority or tyrannical majority.

Essentially, the problem of making democracy work better falls upon the liberally educated citizen who participates in government. The better the education and the larger the number of citizens participating—inevitably, the better the democracy.

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Sandra Clark)

One of the foremost inventions of all times is a giant machine called democracy. First discovered by the Greeks, it was later enlarged by the Romans to serve a growing population. Some 180 years ago it was again improved, and since that time it has been used as the means of governing one of the greatest nations on earth, the United States of America. Like any other machine, however, democracy can be thrown out of gear by a single loose bolt or one missing external force threaten to destroy this machine it is particularly important that all of its working